



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/546,101	04/10/2000	James M. Carney	5181-37301	2577

7590 08/09/2002

Eric B Meyertons
Conley Rose & Tayon PC
PO Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER

DINH, TUAN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2827

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/546,101	CARNEY ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Tuan T Dinh	2827	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4, 7-23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1, 12, and 22 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, line 4, please, delete "and".

Claim 1, line 6, please, delete ";" and insert --, and--.

Claim 12, line 3, please, delete "and".

Claim 12, line 5, please, delete ";" and insert --, and--.

Claim 22, line 5, please, delete "and".

Claim 22, line 7, please, delete ";" and insert --, and--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-4, and 7-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, line 1, it is unclear. The phrase of "a card retention system for a computer system" is not understood. Does applicant mean "a card retention system for retaining a card within a computer system?"

Regarding claim 1, line 4, it is confuse. The phrase of "a retainer pivotally positionable in the carrier" is not understood. Does applicant mean "a retainer pivotally positions/positioned or not positions/positioned in the carrier?"

Regarding claim 1, lines 5-6 and claim 22, lines 6-7, it is unclear. The phrase of "a lock mechanism configured to inhibit rotation of the retainer to an open position when the retainer is in a closed position" is not understood.

Regarding claim 12, lines 6-7, it is confuse. The phrase of "wherein a portion of the retainer contacts the inhibit rotation when the retainer is in the closed position to inhibit rotation of the retainer to an open position" is not understood.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, and 7-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hass et al. (U. S. Patent 6,215,688) in view of Carney et al. (U. S. Patent 5,673,175).

As best understood to claims 1 and 22-23, Hass discloses a card retention mechanism for a card (104) within a computer system (122-figure 1, column 2, line 29) as shown in figures 1-9 comprising

a card (104-figure 1, column 2, line 31) having an endplate (108, column 2, lines 34-35);

a carrier (814-figure 6, column 8, line 8) is configured to mount within the computer system (see figure 1);

a retainer (600-figures 6-9, column 6, line 57) is pivotally positioned (column 7, lines 11-29) in the carrier (814), and

at least one surface of the retainer couples to the endplate of the card, when the retainer is in a closed position (604), and inhibits movement of the card (see figure 6).

Hass does not teach a lock mechanism configured to inhibit rotation of the retainer when the retainer is in closed position.

Carney teaches a locking mechanism (see figure 5) configured to inhibit rotation of a retainer (57 and 68, column 3, lines 24-25, and 34) when the retainer is in closed position (see figures 2-4).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a locking mechanism as taught by Carney to modify the card retention system in order to engage or disengage a retainer when the retainer being inhibit rotation to lock/unlock a card in a computer system. Also, the locking mechanism uses to hold or release the retainer when a user being inserted or removed the card from the computer system.

As to claim 2, Hass discloses the card retention system wherein the lock mechanism comprises an engagement surface (804, column 7, line 55) on the carrier (814) and a protrusion (800; 808) extending from the retainer, wherein the protrusion interacts with the engagement surface to inhibit rotation of the retainer to the open position (see figures 6 and 8).

As to claim 3, Hass discloses a card retention system wherein the retainer further comprises a grip (608, column 7, line 2) configured to facilitate retraction of the protrusion to allow the retainer being rotated in the open position.

As to claims 4, and 10, Hass discloses all of the limitations of claimed invention, except for a color of a retainer being different than a color of a carrier and a grip.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the retention mechanism of Hass and provide the color different between the retainer and the carrier and the grip in order to easy recognize for user when insert/remove cards from a computer system.

As to claim 7, Hass discloses a card retention system as shown in figure 6 further comprising a second retainer rotatably mounted to the carrier adjacent to the retainer, the second retainer configured to hold a second card within the computer system.

As to claim 8, Hass discloses a card retention system as shown in figure 6 wherein the card comprises a blanking cover (108).

As to claim 9, Hass inherently discloses a card retention system as shown in figure 1-6 wherein the card electrically (connector) couples to a circuit board (motherboard) of the computer system, and wherein the retainer inhibits the card from

being electrically uncoupled from the circuit board when the retainer is in the closed position.

As to claim 11, Hass discloses a card retention system as shown in figure 4 further comprising a processor (431) coupled to the computer system.

As best understood to claim 12, Hass discloses the retention mechanism for retaining a card (104) within a computer system (122) as shown in figures 1-9 comprising

a carrier (814) configured to mount within the computer system;
a retainer (600-figures 6-9, column 6, line 57) pivotally coupled to the carrier, the retainer having at least one surface configured to engage (604) the card when the retainer is in a closed position (see figure 6).

Hass does not teach a carrier comprises rotation inhibitor and a portion of the retainer contacts the rotation inhibitor of the carrier when the retainer is in closed position.

Carney teaches a carrier (24) comprises rotation inhibitor (41-figure 1); and a portion (72) of the retainer (57) contacts the rotation inhibitor (41) when the retainer (57) is in closed position (see figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a rotation inhibitor as taught by Carney to modify the card retention system in order to engage a retainer when the retainer being inhibit rotation to contact to a carrier in a system. Also, the inhibitor uses to hold the retainer when a user being inserted or removed the card from the computer system.

As to claim 13, Hass discloses the retention mechanism as shown in figures 6-9 further comprising a second rotation inhibitor (612) configured to hold the retainer in an open position during use.

As to claims 14, and 16, Hass discloses all of the limitations of claimed invention, except for a color of a retainer being different than a color of a carrier and a grip.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the retention mechanism of Hass and provide the color different between the retainer and the carrier and the grip in order to easily recognize for user when insert/remove cards from a computer system.

As to claim 15, Hass discloses a card retention system wherein the retainer further comprises a grip (608, column 7, line 2) configured to facilitate retraction of the protrusion to allow the retainer being rotated in the open position.

Regarding claims 17-21, the method steps are necessitated by the retention mechanism structures, as it is disclosed by Hass in view of Carney.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, and 7-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan T Dinh whose telephone number is 703-306-5856. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Talbott can be reached on 703-305-9883. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-1341 for regular communications and 703-308-1341 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

TD
August 7, 2002

Albert W. Paladini 8-8-02
ALBERT W. PALADINI
PRIMARY EXAMINER